arXiv:1411.5849v1 [cs.DS] 21 Nov 2014

Solving Hamiltonian Cycle by an EPT Algorithm for a Non-sparse Parameter

Sigve Hortemo Sæther*

University of Bergen

Abstract

Many hard graph problems, such as Hamiltonian Cycle, become FPT when parameterized by treewidth, a parameter that is bounded only on sparse graphs. When parameterized by the more general parameter clique-width, Hamiltonian Cycle becomes W[1]-hard, as shown by Fomin et al. [5]. Sæther and Telle address this problem in their paper [13] by introducing a new parameter, split-matching-width, which lies between treewidth and clique-width in terms of generality. They show that even though graphs of restricted split-matching-width might be dense, solving problems such as Hamiltonian Cycle can be done in FPT time.

Recently, it was shown that Hamiltonian Cycle parameterized by treewidth is in EPT [1, 6], meaning it can be solved in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$-time. In this paper, using tools from [6], we show that also parameterized by split-matching-width Hamiltonian Cycle is EPT. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first EPT algorithm for any "globally constrained" graph problem parameterized by a non-trivial and non-sparse structural parameter. To accomplish this, we also give an algorithm constructing a branch decomposition approximating the minimum split-matching-width to within a constant factor. Combined, these results show that the algorithms in [13] for Edge Dominating Set, Chromatic Number and Max Cut all can be improved. We also show that for Hamiltonian Cycle and Max Cut the resulting algorithms are asymptotically optimal under the Exponential Time Hypothesis.

1 Introduction

The problem of finding a Hamiltonian Cycle in a graph - a simple cycle covering all the vertices of the graph - is NP-complete [10]. One way to handle an NP-hard problem is by investigating its parameterized complexity, for various choices of parameter. Unlike a lot of other NP-hard graph problems, Hamiltonian Cycle does not have a natural parameter, since the solution size is the number of

*Supported by the Norwegian Research Council.

vertices in the input graph. Instead, we may look at structural parameterizations of the input graph, for instance its treewidth or clique-width.

A lot of NP-hard graph problems become fixed parameter tractable (FPT, solvable in $f(k)n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$-time for parameter-value k) when parameterized by treewidth. Many examples of problems that can be checked locally, e.g., Independent Set, Vertex Cover, Dominating Set and so on, are even EPT when parameterized by treewidth, meaning that the problems can be solved in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ [4] (also referred to as having a single exponential algorithm). When parameterized by clique-width, hardly any of these problems are known to be EPT. For instance Dominating Set has recently been shown solvable in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k \log k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for clique-width k [11], but this is still not EPT.

For problems that have a global constraint, like Steiner Tree, Hamiltonian Cycle and Feedback Vertex Set, EPT algorithms parameterized by treewidth were for a long time not known. For example, the asymptotically best algorithm for Hamiltonian Cycle was for a long time the folklore $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ time algorithm, resulting in a belief that graph problems with a global requirement may not have EPT algorithms. Recently, however, a breakthrough paper by Cygan et al. [3] gave a randomized EPT algorithm for Hamiltonian Cycle, and other problems with global constraints, when parameterized by treewidth. Shortly after this, Bodlaender et al. [1] and then Fomin et al. [6], also found deterministic EPT algorithms for Hamiltonian Cycle parameterized by treewidth. Both the papers [1, 6] are general, in the sense that they provide a framework for solving many problems. Graph classes of bounded treewidth are all sparse, so one may wonder if using either of these new frameworks will help in finding similar EPT results for globally constrained problems like Hamiltonian Cycle for a parameter bounded also on non-sparse graph classes. The classical structural graph parameter bounded also on some non-sparse graphs is clique-width. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that such a result exists for clique-width, as Hamiltonian Cycle has been shown to be W-hard when parameterized by clique-width [5]. So, we must focus on a non-sparse parameter which is less general than clique-width. Examples of some such parameters are modular-width, shrub-depth, neighbourhood diversity, twin-cover, and the newly introduced split-matching-width (see Figure 1).

In the recent paper [7] Gajarský et al. give an FPT algorithm (but not EPT) for Hamiltonian Cycle parameterized by modular-width, and show W-hardness when parameterized by shrub-depth. Split-matching-width is a new parameter introduced by Sæther and Telle [13] for which Hamiltonian Cycle is FPT [13]. Unlike modular-width, split-matching-width generalizes treewidth, so it is a good candidate for applying the framework used for treewidth.

In this paper, we will show that using the framework of [6] we can solve Hamiltonian Cycle in time $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ for parameter k being split-matching-width. The approach will be similar to that of [13] in the sense that it consists of two parts; (1) given a graph G, finding a branch decomposition of low split-matching-width, and then (2) solving Hamiltonian Cycle on G with a runtime depending on the split-matching-width of the computed branch decomposition. We will in this paper improve on the results from [13] by showing the following two theorems that when combined results in an EPT algorithm for Hamiltonian

Cycle parameterized by split-matching-width.

Theorem 1. *Given a graph G of split-matching-width less than k, in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ time we can find a branch decomposition of split-matching-width less than $16k$.*

Theorem 2. *Given a graph G and a branch decomposition of split-matching-width k, we can decide if G has a Hamiltonian Cycle in time $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.*

Another result of Theorem 1 is that we can improve the runtime of the algorithms for solving Edge Dominating Set, Chromatic Number, and Max Cut parameterized by split-matching-width described in [13]. In fact, under the Exponential Time Hypothesis the asymptotic runtimes for Max Cut, Hamiltonian Cycle, and Edge Dominating Set become optimal [8, 9][1]. (I.e., no $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{o(k)}$ algorithm exists.)

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we give the necessary definitions and background needed for the rest of the paper and in Section 3 we prove Theorem 2. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1, and then we end this paper in Section 5 where we give a short summary.

The symbol $\star$ denotes that the proof can be found in the Appendix.



Figure 1: A small overview of how certain graph width parameters relate to each other. A directed path from parameter a to b means that there exists a function f so that for all graphs G, $b(G) \leq f(a(G))$. The arrows related to sm-width are from [13], for the others see Gajarský et al. [7]. The colors depict the complexity of Hamiltonian Cycle parameterized with the respective parameters.

[1] see the Appendix for the lower bound on Edge Dominating Set

2 Preliminaries and terminology

Graph and set preliminaries. We work on simple undirected graphs $G = (V, E)$ and denote the set of vertices and set of edges of a graph G by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. We use n to denote the number of vertices of the graph in question. For an edge between vertices u and v, we simply write uv. For a path P, by writing uPv we mean that the endpoints of P are u and v. For a graph G and subset $A \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[A]$ the subgraph of G *induced* by A. That is, the vertex set $V(G[A])$ of $G[A]$ is A and the edge set is $E(G[A]) = \{uv \in E(G) : u, v \in A\}$. For disjoint sets $A, B \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[A, B]$ the bipartite subgraph of G induced by the pair (A, B). That is $V(G[A, B]) = A \cup B$ and $E(G[A, B]) = \{uv \in E(G) : u \in A, v \in B\}$. For a set of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $N_G(S)$ all the vertices in $V(G) \setminus S$ adjacent to S. We omit the subscript G in $N_G(S)$ when it is clear from context. For a single vertex v, we write $N_G(v)$ instead of $N_G(\{v\})$. To *contract* an edge uv means to replace the vertices u and v by a new vertex v_{uv} adjacent to exactly the same vertices as u and v combined. For a set $A \subseteq V(G)$, when $V(G)$ is clear from context, we write $\overline{A}$ to mean the set $V(G) \setminus A$. For a graph G and subsets $A, B, C \subseteq V(G)$, we say that C separates A and B if there are no paths from $A \setminus C$ to $B \setminus C$ in $G[\overline{C}]$.

Hamiltonian Cycle and Certificates. A Hamiltonian Cycle in a graph G is a simple cycle in G of size $|V(G)|$. In this paper we will solve Hamiltonian Cycle using dynamic programming. The framework we use will be the same as in [13]. That is, a *certificate* is a set of edges forming vertex disjoint paths or a Hamiltonian cycle, and a witness is a Hamiltonian cycle. We denote by $\text{cert}(X)$ all the certificates C so that $C \subseteq E(G[X])$. For two disjoint sets A and B and certificates $s_a \in \text{cert}(A)$ and $s_b \in \text{cert}(B)$, we define the operation $\oplus(s_a, s_b)$ to be the set of all the certificates s' in $\text{cert}(A \cup B)$ on the form $s' = s_b \cup s_b \cup E'$ for some set $E' \subseteq E(G[A, B])$. For sets $S_A \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$ and $S_B \subseteq \text{cert}(B)$ we denote by $\oplus(S_A, S_B)$ the union of all $\oplus(S_a, S_b)$ where $S_a \in S_A$ and $S_b \in S_B$. From these definitions, we see that it is always the case for disjoint sets A and B, $\text{cert}(A \cup B) = \oplus(\text{cert}(A), \text{cert}(B))$.

For two sets $A_1, A_2 \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$, we say that A_1 *preserves* A_2, denoted $A_1 \preceq_A A_2$, if for all $B \in \text{cert}(V \setminus A)$, if $\oplus(A_1, \{B\})$ contains a witness, then $\oplus(A_2, \{B\})$ contains a witness. We note that if $A_1 \preceq_A A_2$ then for any C disjoint from A, and $X \subseteq \text{cert}(C)$, we have $\oplus(A_1, X) \preceq_{A \cup C} \oplus(A_2, X)$.

Splits and split decompositions. A *split* of a connected graph G is a bi-partition (A, B) of the vertices $V(G)$ where $|A|, |B| \geq 2$ and for all $a \in N(B)$, $N(a) \cap B = N(A)$. That is, all vertices in A adjacent to B have the same neighbourhood in B. Notice that this property holds if and only if also for all $b \in N(A)$, $N(b) \cap A = N(B)$. A bi-partition (A, B) where either A or B consists of at most one vertex is said to be a *trivial split*.

A graph G having a split (A, B) can be *decomposed* into smaller graphs G_A

and G_B where G_A is the graph G with all the vertices of B replaced by a single vertex v, called a *marker*, adjacent to the same vertices in G_A as B is adjacent to in G. G_B is in the same way the graph G where we replace the vertices A by the marker vertex v so that $N_{G_B}(v) = N_G(A)$. A graph without a split is called a *prime graph*. Since all graphs of three or less vertices trivially do not contain any splits, we say that a prime graph on more than three vertices is a *non-trivial* prime graph.

A *split decomposition* of a graph G is a recursive decomposition of G so that all of the obtained graphs are prime. For a split decomposition of G into $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$, a *split decomposition tree* is a tree T where each vertex corresponds to a prime graph and we have an edge between two vertices if and only if the prime graphs they correspond to share a marker. That is, the edge set of the tree is $E(T) = \{v_i v_j : v_i, v_j \in V(T) \text{ and } V(G_i) \cap V(G_j) \neq \emptyset\}$. See Figure 2 for an example. Given a split decomposition of graph G with prime graphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_k$, we define $\text{tot}(v : G_i)$ recursively to be $\{v\}$ if $v \in V(G)$, and otherwise to be $\bigcup_{u \in V(G_j) \setminus \{v\}} \text{tot}(u : G_j)$ for the graph $G_j \neq G_i$ containing the marker v in the split decomposition. Another way of saying this latter part by the use of the split decomposition tree T is: if v is not in $V(G)$, then $\text{tot}(v : G_i)$ is defined to be the vertices of $V(G)$ residing in the prime graphs of the connected component in $T[V(T) \setminus \{G_i\}]$ where v is also located. For a set $V' \subseteq V(G_i)$, we define $\text{tot}(V' : G_i)$ to be the union of $\text{tot}(v : G_i)$ for all $v \in V'$. We define the *active set* of a vertex $v \in G_i$, denoted $\text{act}(v : G_i)$ to be the vertices of $\text{tot}(v : G_i)$ that are contributing to the neighborhood of v in G_i. That is, $\text{act}(v : G_i)$ is defined as $N(V(G) \setminus \text{tot}(v : G_i))$. Note that if G has a split decomposition into prime graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_k$, then for any marker v there are exactly two prime graphs G_i and G_j containing v, and we have $\text{tot}(v : G_i) \cup \text{tot}(v : G_j) = V(G)$. When the prime graph G_i is clear from context, we denote $\text{tot}(X : G_i)$ and $\text{act}(X : G_i)$ simply as $\text{tot}(X)$ and $\text{act}(X)$. See Figure 2 for an example of tot() and act(). For a prime graph G' and vertex $v \in V(G')$, when we say the *weight* of v, we mean the cardinality of $\text{act}(v)$.



Figure 2: A graph G on vertices a, b, c, d, e, f, g on the left, and a the graph G decomposed through the split $(\{a, b, c, g\}.\{d, e, f\})$ to the upper right. Notice the introduction of marker v_1. To the lower right we have a split decomposition tree of G with markers v_1 and v_2. In the prime graph with vertices $\{v_1, d, v_2\}$ we have $\text{tot}(v_1) = \{a, b, c, g\}$ and $\text{act}(v_1) = \{b, c\}$. The weight of v_2 in the rightmost prime graph drawn in the split decomposition tree is three while in the middle prime graph it is one.

Split-matching-width. A branch decomposition of a set X is a description of recursively dividing X into smaller and smaller sets until only single element sets are left. Formally, a branch decomposition of X is a pair (T, δ) where T is a subcubic tree (a tree of max degree three) and δ is a bijection from the leaves in T to the elements in X. In this paper, when we say a branch decomposition of a graph G, we will mean a branch decomposition of $V(G)$.

A cut of X is a bi-partition of X. Each edge e of a branch decomposition (an edge in the tree) describes a cut/bi-partition of X, namely the cut (A, B) where A are all the elements that are mapped to from δ by the leaves on one side of e and B are the elements mapped by δ from the leaves of the other side of e. For a set X, a *cut function* $f : 2^X \to \mathbb{N}$ is a symmetric ($f(A) = f(\overline{A})$) function on subsets of X. For a branch decomposition (T, δ) of G and a cut function f on $V(G)$, its f-width is the maximum of $f(A)$ over all cuts $(A, \overline{A})$ of G induced by the edges of T. For a graph G, its f-width, for a cut function f, is the minimum f-width over all branch decompositions of G.

The Maximum-Matching-width (mm-width) $\mathrm{mmw}(G)$ of a graph G was defined by Vatshelle [15] based on the cut function mm defined for $A \subseteq V(G)$ as the size of a maximum matching in $G[A, V \setminus A]$.

The split-matching-width (sm-width) $\mathrm{smw}(G)$ of a graph G was defined by Sæther and Telle [13] based on the cut function sm defined using splits and mm as follows:

$$\mathrm{sm}(A) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (A, \overline{A}) \text{ is a split of } G \\ \mathrm{mm}(A) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

A function $f : 2^X \to \mathbb{N}$ is said to be *submodular* if for any subset $A, B \subseteq X$ it holds that $f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B)$.

3 Solving Hamiltonian Cycle in EPT time

From Theorem 3 of [6] applied to a *graphic matroid* we have the following corollary, which is the core tool for getting our EPT algorithm.

Corollary 3 ([6])**.** *Let G be a connected graph on n vertices and S a family of p-sized subsets of $E(G)$. We can for any integer q find a subset $\hat{S}$ of S with $|\hat{S}| \leq 2^n$ so that for any q-sized subset Y of $E(G)$, if there exists a set $X \in S$ disjoint from Y so that $X \cup Y$ is a forest, then there exists a set $\hat{X} \in \hat{S}$ disjoint from Y so that $\hat{X} \cup Y$ is a forest. Furthermore, the set $\hat{S}$ can be computed in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|4^n)$ time.*

This might not seem like something related to finding Hamiltonian Cycles, since finding a largest forest is polynomial time solvable and finding a largest cycle is NP-complete. However, as shown in [6], many NP-complete problems that contain a global connectivity constraint, for instance Steiner Tree and Hamiltonian Cycle, can be solved faster by the use of Corollary 3. In [6], the authors focus more on the Steiner Tree problem and less on Hamiltonian Cycle, so the precise usage of Corollary 3 applied to Hamiltonian Cycle is not very

explicit. The following result can, however, be deduced from their paper, but as it is such a crucial part of our paper, we need all the details formally stated.

Lemma 4 ($\star$)**.** *Let G be a graph and $A \subseteq V(G)$ some set of vertices separated from $V(G) \setminus A$ by $C \subseteq V(G)$ of size at least three. Given a family S of subsets of edges of $E(G[A \cup C])$, we can in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|12^{|C|})$ time construct a family $\hat{S} \subseteq S$ of size at most $6^{|C|}$ so that for any set Y of edges in $E(G[C \cup \overline{A}])$, if there exists a set $X \in S$ disjoint from Y so that $Y \cup X$ is a Hamiltonian cycle, then there exists a set $\hat{X} \in \hat{S}$ disjoint from Y so that $\hat{X} \cup Y$ is a Hamiltonian cycle.*

Lemma 4 gives an insight to how it is possible to make EPT algorithms for Hamiltonian Cycle parameterized by treewidth, as done in [6]. The idea is to build a set of partial solutions using dynamic programming in a bottom up manner in a tree decomposition, and at each step use Lemma 4 to reduce the number of partial solutions needed to ensure you will find a Hamiltonian cycle in the end of your algorithm. This works because at each step of the algorithm all partial solutions will be disjoint paths that have all their endpoints inside a small separator (a bag in the tree decomposition). However, when parameterizing by split-matching width, even for cuts of small mm-value and a vertex cover C of small size, the partial solutions (certificates) will not necessarily consist of paths that have endpoints inside C, but possibly in $N(C)$, which could be large. To overcome this problem, we define what we call an *extension*.

An extension of a certificate is a certificate plus some extra edges. The idea is that an extension will encompass how a certificate $C \in \text{cert}(X)$ looks after adding more edges than those in $E(G[X])$. Formally, for a certificate $C \in \text{cert}(X)$ and set of edges E^* disjoint from $E(G[X])$, we say that a set $S \subseteq \{C \cup E' : E' \subseteq E^*\}$ is an extension of C by the set E^*. For a set of certificates P, the set S is an extension of P by E' if it is a union of extensions by E' of the certificates in P. For a set of certificates P we say that an extension S of P by E^* is *preserving* if for any edge set Y not intersecting $E(G[A]) \cup E^*$, if there is a certificate $C \in P$ and $E' \subseteq E^*$ so that $Y \cup C \cup E'$ is a Hamiltonian cycle, then there is an element $C' \in S$ so that $C' \cup Y$ is a Hamiltonian cycle. A preserving extension of a single certificate C is simply a preserving extension of $\{C\}$.

Observation 5. *For $P \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$ and edges $E' \subseteq E(G[A, \overline{A}])$, if $\mathcal{S}$ is a preserving extension of P by E', then $\{S \setminus E' : S \in \mathcal{S}\}$ preserves P.*

Motivated by Observation 5, we give the following lemma, which will be used to reduce the number of certificates needed to preserve certificate sets over sets of small mm-value. The result of this is captured in Corollary 7.

Lemma 6 ($\star$)**.** *Given a set of certificates $S \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$ and a vertex cover C of $G[A, \overline{A}]$ of size at least three, we can in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|2^{\mathcal{O}(|C|)})$ time create a preserving extension of S by $E^* = E(G[A, C \setminus A])$ of size no larger than $6^{|C|}$.*

Corollary 7. *Given a set $S \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$, and a vertex cover C of $G[A, \overline{A}]$ where $3 \leq |C| = k$, we can in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|2^{\mathcal{O}(k)})$ time find a set $\hat{S} \subseteq S$ so that $\hat{S} \preceq_A S$ and $|\hat{S}| \leq 6^k$.*

Combining Corollary 7 with the result of [13] saying that for a split $(A, \overline{A})$ and a set $S \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$ of certificates, we can in time polynomial in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}|S|$-time compute a set $S' \preceq_A S$ of size $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$, we get the following.

Corollary 8. *For a set $A \subseteq V(G)$ and set $S \subseteq \text{cert}(A)$, we can in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{sm}(A))}$ time compute a set $S' \preceq_A S$ of size $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(\text{sm}(A))}$.*

Now that we have defined preserving extensions, and already shown how we can use this to reduce the size of a preserving set of certificates, we will show how we can also use extensions to produce small sets S preserving $\oplus(S_1, S_2)$ for certificates S_1 and S_2. This is the last step needed to create our dynamic programming algorithm for Hamiltonian cycle.

Lemma 9. *For a tri-partition (A, B, W) of $V(G)$, and $S_a \in \text{cert}(A)$ and $S_b \in \text{cert}(B)$, for $k = \max\{\text{mm}(A), \text{mm}(B)\}$ we can in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ time compute a set $S \subseteq \oplus(S_a, S_b)$ so that $S \preceq_{A\cup B} \oplus(S_a, S_b)$ of size at most $2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.*

Proof. The case when both $(A, \overline{A})$ and $(B, \overline{B})$ are splits, we can construct a preserving set S of size polynomial in n in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ time as shown by [13]. So, we will only give proof for the case when at least one of A and B are not splits.

We first assume that there exists a certificate $S_w \in \text{cert}(W)$ so that the set $\oplus(\oplus(S_a, S_b), \{S_w\})$ contains a witness $H = S_a \cup S_b \cup S_w \cup E'$ where E' is disjoint from the three certificates. Let $X_a \subseteq A$ and $X_b \subseteq B$ be the set of vertices in A and B incident with less than two edges of S_a and S_b, respectively. That is, X_a and X_b are exactly the vertices of A and B, respectively, that are incident with E'.

We now show that if a witness H as described above exists, then $|X_a| \leq 2\,\text{mm}(A)$ and $|X_b| \leq 2\,\text{mm}(B)$. Without loss of generality, we prove that this holds for X_a. As each vertex in X_a must be incident with an edge of E', and each vertex in $\overline{A}$ can be incident to at most two edges of E' since H is a simple cycle, there is a matching in E' of at least half the size of X_a, implying that $|X_a| \leq 2\,\text{mm}(A)$. The same also holds for X_b. Let C be a vertex cover of $G[A, \overline{A}]$. If both $\text{mm}(A), \text{mm}(B) \leq k$, then $C \cup X_a \cup X_b$ is a vertex cover of size $\mathcal{O}(k)$. This means that by Lemma 6 that we can construct a preserving extension $\hat{S_a}$ of S_a by $E(G[A, (C \cup X_b) \setminus A])$ of size $6^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, which combined with S_b must preserve $\oplus(S_a, S_b)$. That is, $S' = \{S'_a \cup S_b : S'_a \in \hat{S_a}\}$.

For the case when either $\text{mm}(A) > \text{sm}(A)$ or $\text{mm}(B) > \text{sm}(B)$, we need a slightly different argument. Assume without loss of generality that $\text{mm}(B) > \text{sm}(B)$, and thus $(B, \overline{B})$ is a split. As before $|X_a| \leq 2k$, but now $|X_b|$ is possibly very large. What we notice though, is that as each vertex of X_a can be incident to at most two edges of E', the number of edges in E' incident with X_a is at most $2|X_a| \leq 4k$. This means that no more than $4k$ of the paths in S_b will connect directly to S_b by the edges in E'. As all endpoints of all paths in S_b (including isolated vertices, which can be thought of as paths of length zero) have the same neighbourhood in $\overline{B}$ and are interchangeable, we can simply disregard all but $4k$ paths of S_b, and do the same for the remaining $4k$ paths as we did for S_b for the case when there were no splits. This means the set X_b is of size at most $8k$ instead of $4k$, but this constant disappears in the $\mathcal{O}$-notation. □ □

We now have the means to prove Theorem 2. The following recursive algorithm will, based on Lemma 9 and Corollary 7 decide Hamiltonian cycle in EPT time given a branch decomposition (T, δ) of sm-width k:

We subdivide an arbitrary edge of T (add a vertex "in the middle" of it) and root T in the new vertex r from the subdivision, and then in a bottom up manner compute for each node $v \in T$ with children $c_1, c_2 \in T$ a set $S_v \preceq_{\delta(v)} \text{cert}(\delta(v))$. We do this by applying Lemma 9 on each pair of certificates of S_{c_1} and S_{c_2} and then bounding the size of S_v by Corollary 7. For the base case where $v \in T$ is a leaf, $\text{cert}(\delta(v))$ can be computed exactly in polynomial time. In the root node, we have computed $S \preceq_{\delta(c_1) \cup \delta(c_2)} \text{cert}(\delta(c_1) \cup \delta(c_2)) = \text{cert}(V(G))$. Deciding the Hamiltonian cycle problem can then be answered easily by checking each certificate in S_r whether or not it is a Hamiltonian cycle, by polynomial amount of work for each certificate. The total amount of work is bounded by the number of nodes in T (which is n), times the work spent at each node, which by Lemma 9 and Corollary 7 is bounded by $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)} 2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

4 Approximating sm-width

In [13], Sæther and Telle gave an algorithm for constructing an algorithm of split-matching-width $\mathcal{O}(\text{sm}(G)^2)$ in FPT time. Their procedure consisted of four main steps;

1. construct a split decomposition $\mathcal{D}$ of G,
2. compute a branch decomposition of sm-width less than $9k$ for each prime graph in $\mathcal{D}$ where $\text{smw}(G) < k$,
3. adjust each branch decomposition slightly so that the lifted-sm-width of each decomposition becomes less than $54k^2$, and then finally
4. combine all the branch decompositions together to form a branch decomposition for G of sm-width less than $54k^2$.

In this paper we will keep the general structure as in [13], but we will replace steps (2) and (3) by a single step where we compute branch decompositions for each prime graph of lifted-sm-width bounded by $18k$ directly. The last part is covered by the following theorem which can be extracted from the proof of Theorem 13 in [13], and the first part was shown by [2] to be computable in polynomial time, so we will focus this section on constructing branch decompositions of low lifted-sm-width for prime graphs.

Theorem 10 ([13])**.** *Given a graph G and a split decomposition $\mathcal{D}$ over prime graphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots$ with corresponding branch decompositions $(T_1, \delta_1), (T_2, \delta_2), \ldots$ all of lifted-sm-width k, we can in polynomial time construct a branch decomposition for G of sm-width k.*

The difference between the approach of this paper and of [13] is that we in this paper explicitly define the lifted version of the cut function sm, and show that this cut function directly can be approximated to a linear factor of $\mathrm{sm}(G)$.

Lifted sm-width

For a cut function f and prime graph G' of some split decomposition of G, we denote by f^ℓ the value of f *lifted* from G' to G. That is, $f^\ell(X) = f(\mathrm{tot}(X : G'))$. We may also refer to this by simply writing "lifted-f".

Theorem 11 ([13])**.** *The cut function* mm*-value is submodular.*

Theorem 12 ([12])**.** *For a symmetric submodular cut-function f and graph G of optimal f-width k, a branch decomposition of f-width at most $3k+1$ can be found in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(2^{3k+1})$ time.*

From the definition of submodularity, and Theorem 11 saying that mm is submodular, we can deduce that also lifted-mm is submodular. We simply substitute $\mathrm{mm}^\ell(X)$ by $\mathrm{mm}(\mathrm{tot}(X))$ in the submodularity inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{mm}^\ell(A) + \mathrm{mm}^\ell(B) &= \mathrm{mm}(\mathrm{tot}(A)) + \mathrm{mm}(\mathrm{tot}(B)) \\ &\geq \mathrm{mm}(\mathrm{tot}(A \cup B)) + \mathrm{mm}(\mathrm{tot}(A \cap B)) \\ &= \mathrm{mm}^\ell(A \cup B) + \mathrm{mm}^\ell(A \cap B).\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 13. *Lifted-*mm*-value is submodular.*

Corollary 14 ($\star$)**.** *For a graph of lifted-*mm*-width k, we can find a branch decomposition of mm^ℓ-width at most $3k+1$ in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(2^{3k})$ time.*

Lemma 15 ($\star$)**.** *Let G be a graph and $\mathcal{D}$ a split decomposition of G. For any prime graph G' in $\mathcal{D}$ there exists a branch decomposition (T, δ) of G' of sm^ℓ-width $\leq 3\,\mathrm{smw}(G)$.*

The following lemma is an improvement of Lemma 7 of [13], which cascades throughout their paper, improving their analysis to show that the resulting branch decomposition is of sm-width $36\,\mathrm{sm}(G)^2$ instead of $54\,\mathrm{sm}(G)^2$. We may note that without the below lemma, we could use Lemma 7 of [13] to get a 27 approximation instead of a 18 approximation.

Lemma 16 ($\star$)**.** *Let G be a graph of split-matching-width less than k, and G' a non-trivial prime graph in a split decomposition of G. For any vertex v in G' of weight at least $3k$, v is either adjacent to exactly one other vertex of weight at least $3k$ or the* mm*-value of $\mathrm{tot}(v)$ is less than $6k$.*

As we notice from Lemma 16, vertices of weight $3k$ are more restricted than the rest of the vertices. We say that a vertex of weight at least $3k$ is *heavy*, and an edge incident with two heavy vertices is called a *heavy* edge.

For a heavy edge uv, if a branch decomposition of lifted-sm-width less than $3k$ induce a non-trivial cut (A, B), it must be the case that u and v are either both

in A or both in B. Otherwise, the lifted-sm-width will be too large. This means that in any branch decomposition of lifted-sm-width less than $3k$, $(\{uv\}, \overline{\{uv\}})$ must be a cut induced by the decomposition.

Corollary 17. *By contracting each heavy edge uv in a prime graph G' of G to single vertices v_{uv}, letting $\mathrm{tot}(v_{uv}) = \mathrm{tot}(\{u, v\})$, we get a graph of mm^ℓ-width at most $6\,\mathrm{sm}(G)$.*

Based on Corollary 17, and Corollary 14 saying that we can 3-approximate the width, we get the a branch decomposition of sm^ℓ-width $18\,\mathrm{sm}(G)$ for each prime graph of G.

Lemma 18. *For a graph G and prime graph G' in a branch decomposition of G, a branch decomposition (T, δ) over G' of lifted-*sm*-width at most* 18 *times the optimal sm-width k of G can be generated in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(2^{18k})$ time.*

Proof. By first contracting each heavy edge as described in Corollary 17, we have a graph of lifted-mm-width less than $6k$. By Corollary 14, we can construct a branch decomposition of sm^ℓ-width less than $18k$. For each contracted heavy edge uv, we append u and v to the leaf v_{uv} corresponding to the contracted edge. This will only alter the decomposition in the form of adding trivial cuts, i.e., splits. And thus, the lifted sm^ℓ-width of the decomposition remains the same. □ □

Lemma 18 completes the part of finding branch decompositions of the prime graphs with lifted-sm-width only a linear factor larger than the original graph. Putting Lemma 18 together with the fact that we can find a split decomposition in polynomial time by [2] and Theorem 10 saying that we can combine lifted-sm-decompositions of prime graphs together to form a branch decomposition of the original graph, we have proved Theorem 1 as promised.

5 Conclusions

We have shown a dynamic programming algorithm solving Hamiltonian Cycle in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$ time when given a branch decomposition of sm-width k. We have also supplied an algorithm for finding a branch decomposition of a graph G of sm-width $\mathcal{O}(\mathrm{sm}(G))$ by focusing on lifted-sm-width of prime graphs. This results in an EPT algorithm for Hamiltonian Cycle. In fact, combining the algorithm for finding branch decompositions of low split-matching-width with the three algorithms for solving Chromatic Number, Edge Dominating Set, and Max Cut given in [13], we end up with algorithms of runtime, $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}k^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, and $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}2^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$, respectively, which under the Exponential Time Hypothesis is optimal[8, 9][2] (no algorithm where the $\mathcal{O}(k)$'s are exchanged with $o(k)$'s exist).

[2]For Edge Dominating Set lower bound, see the Appendix.

References

[1] H. L. Bodlaender, M. Cygan, S. Kratsch, and J. Nederlof. Deterministic single exponential time algorithms for connectivity problems parameterized by treewidth. In *Proceedings ICALP*, pages 196–207. Springer, 2013.

[2] W. H. Cunningham. Decomposition of directed graphs. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(2):214–228, 1982.

[3] M. Cygan, J. Nederlof, M. Pilipczuk, J. M. M. van Rooij, and J. O. Wojtaszczyk. Solving connectivity problems parameterized by treewidth in single exponential time. In *Proceedings FOCS*, pages 150–159. IEEE, 2011.

[4] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized complexity theory*, volume 3. Springer, 2006.

[5] F. V. Fomin, P. Golovach, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. Intractability of clique-width parameterizations. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(5):1941–1956, 2010.

[6] F. V. Fomin, D. Lokshtanov, and S. Saurabh. Efficient computation of representative sets with applications in parameterized and exact algorithms. In *Proceedings SODA*, pages 142–151, 2014.

[7] J. Gajarskỳ, M. Lampis, and S. Ordyniak. Parameterized algorithms for modular-width. In *Proceedings IPEC*, pages 163–176. Springer, 2013.

[8] D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, and S. Saurabh. Known algorithms on graphs of bounded treewidth are probably optimal. In *Proceedings SODA*, pages 777–789. SIAM, 2011.

[9] D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, S. Saurabh, et al. Lower bounds based on the exponential time hypothesis. *Bulletin of EATCS*, 3(105), 2013.

[10] R. G. Michael and S. J. David. Computers and intractability: a guide to the theory of np-completeness. *WH Freeman & Co., San Francisco*, 1979.

[11] S. Oum, S. H. Sæther, and M. Vatshelle. Faster algorithms for vertex partitioning problems parameterized by clique-width. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 535:16–24, 2014.

[12] S. Oum and P. Seymour. Approximating clique-width and branch-width. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 96(4):514–528, 2006.

[13] S. H. Sæther and J. A. Telle. Between treewidth and clique-width. *to appear in proceedings of WG 2014*, 2014. Invited to contribute to special section of Algorithmica.

[14] C. A. Tovey. A simplified np-complete satisfiability problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 8(1):85–89, 1984.

[15] M. Vatshelle. *New width parameters of graphs*. PhD thesis, The University of Bergen, 2012.

[16] M. Yannakakis and F. Gavril. Edge dominating sets in graphs. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 38(3):364–372, 1980.

A Appendix

Proposition 19. *If for some $\delta_0 > 0$ there does not exist a $2^{(\delta_0 n)}n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ algorithm for 3-SAT, then there exists a $\delta_1 > 0$ so that no $2^{(\delta_1 n)}n^{\mathcal{O}(n)}$ algorithm exists for Edge Dominating Set.*

Proof. This follows from looking at the NP-hardness reduction from 3-SAT to 3-SAT where each variable occurs at most 3 times [14], and the NP-hardness reduction from 3-SAT where each variable occurs at most 3 times to Edge Dominating Set in bipartite graphs of maximum degree 3 [16]. The resulting Edge Dominating Set instance (G, k) resulting of applying these two reductions on 3-SAT formula ϕ has its number of vertices bounded by a constant factor c times the number of variables in ϕ. So, any $2^{\delta_1 n}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm for Edge Dominating Set implies a $2^{\frac{\delta_1}{c}n}n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}$ algorithm for 3-SAT. □ □

Lemma 20. *Given a graph G of k vertices, and family S of edge-sets, we can in $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|12^k)$ time find a subset $\hat{S}$ of S of size at most 6^k so that for any set Y of edges in $E(G)$, if there exists a set $s \in S$ disjoint from Y so that $s \cup Y$ form a Hamiltonian cycle, then there is a set $\hat{s} \in \hat{S}$ disjoint from Y so that $s \cup Y$ form a Hamiltonian cycle.*

Proof. For a set $x \in S$ let $D_i(x)$ denote the set of vertices in $V(G)$ incident to exactly i of the edges in x, i.e., the vertices of degree i in the graph $(V(G), x)$). We notice that if $Y \cup s$ is a Hamiltonian cycle, then s consists only of vertex disjoint paths. Furthermore, $Y \cup s'$ is a Hamiltonian cycle only if $D_i(s) = D_i(s')$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. So, to produce a smaller subset $\hat{S}$ of S as stated in the lemma, we start by categorizing each of the $s \in S$ that consist of only vertex disjoint paths into one of at most $3^{|V(G)|}$ classes $S[D_0][D_1][D_2]$, depending on the content of $D_i(s)$ (we put s into the class where $D_0 = D_0(s), D_1 = D_1(s)$ and $D_2 = D_2(s)$). One result of this is that all sets in the same class will consist of exactly the same number of edges.

Now we apply Corollary 3 on each of the classes $S[D_0][D_1][D_2]$ with p being the size of the edge sets in the particular class, and $q = n - p - 1$. We put the result into $\hat{S}[D_0][D_1][D_2]$ for each tri-partition D_0, D_1, D_2. We will now show that when $\hat{S}$ is the union of each $\hat{S}[D_0][D_1][D_2]$, then $\hat{S}$ satisfies the statement.

First of all, the size of $\hat{S}$ is at most $3^k 2^k$, since there are at most 3^k equivalence classes, and each class contributes by at most 2^k sets.

Second, we will have to show for every $Y \subseteq E(G)$ so that there exists a set $s \in S$ disjoint from Y where $Y \cup s$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of G, there also exists a set $\hat{s} \in \hat{S}$ so that also $Y \cup \hat{s}$ is a Hamiltonian cycle:

Suppose for disjoint s and Y, $Y \cup s$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of G. This means $D_0(s) = D_2(Y)$, $D_1(s) = D_1(Y)$ and $D_2(s) = D_0(Y)$, and s is an element of $S[D_0(s)][D_1(s)][D_2(s)]$. We claim that for all other $s' \in S[D_0(s)][D_1(s)][D_2(s)]$ the set $Y \cup s'$ is a cycle cover of G. That is, each vertex in $V(G)$ is adjacent to exactly two edges in $Y \cup s'$. We will show that there exists a $s' \in \hat{S}[D_0(s)][D_1(s)][D_2(s)]$ so that the cycle cover $Y \cup s'$ is connected, and hence is a Hamiltonian cycle. Let e be anyi edge in Y, and let Y_e be $Y \setminus \{e\}$.

We notice that $s \cup Y_e$ is a (Hamiltonian) path and hence a subtree in G. That means by Corollary 3, there must be a $\hat{s} \in \hat{S}[D_0(s)][D_1(s)][D_2(s)]$ so that $\hat{s} \cup Y_e$ is a forest. As we know all the elements of $S[D_0(s)][D_1(s)][D_2(s)]$ have the same number of edges, $H' = \hat{s} \cup Y_e$ must contain $|V(G)| - 1$ edges. This means H' is one single component, as we know H' is acyclic. Furthermore, we know $H' \cup \{e\} = \hat{s} \cup (Y_e \cup \{e\})$ is a cycle cover, so $H' \cup \{e\} = \hat{s} \cup Y$ is indeed a Hamiltonian cycle of G. □ □

To prove Lemma 4, we use what is called a *torso*. For a graph G and subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we say that the *torso* of G in S is the graph we get by taking $G[S]$ and then add the edges $\{uv : \exists uPv \in G \text{ s.t. } P \in G \setminus S\}$. In general this means we take $G[S]$ and for each component $C \in G \setminus S$ make $N(C)$ into a clique. In this we speak of a torso in the following proof, the components $C \in G \setminus S$ will only have two neighbours in C, and hence each component will only contribute to the torso by a single edge.

Proof of Lemma 4. Let G' be the complete graph on $V(G)$ (i.e., $V(G') = V(G)$ and $E(G') = \{uv : u \in V(G), v \in V(G)\}$). We notice that for disjoint sets $X \subseteq E(G[A])$ and $Y \subseteq E(G[\overline{A} \cup C])$ $X \cup Y$ form a Hamiltonian cycle in G only if $X \cup Y$ also form a Hamiltonian cycle in G'. Also, $X \cup Y$ can be a Hamiltonian cycle only if for some $Y' \subseteq E(G'[C])$ $X \cup Y'$ is a Hamiltonian cycle (namely the torso Y' of Y in C). So, we will from here on assume $V(G') = V(G) = A \cup C$.

Our goal now will be to reduce the problem from looking at $G'[A \cup C]$ to only looking at $G'[C]$. First notice that unless X induces a disjoint set of paths ending in C which covers all the vertices in $A \setminus C$, then $X \cup Y$ cannot be a Hamiltonian cycle for any $Y \subseteq E(G'[C])$. Let $T \subseteq S$ be the set consisting of all $X \in S$ where X is consisting of such edge disjoint set of paths. For any $X \in T$ and $Y \subseteq E(G'[C])$ $X \cup Y$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of $G'[A \cup C]$ if and only if for the torso X' of X in X, $X' \cup Y$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of $G'[C]$, as depicted in Figure 3. Therefore, to construct the set $\hat{S}$ in the statement of the lemma, we do the following:

We first let T' be the set of these torso's. By first removing all the duplicates in T' and then applying Lemma 20 to it, we get a subset $\hat{T}'$ of size at most $6^{|C|}$. The set $\hat{S} = \{X \in T : X' \in \hat{T}'\}$ will thus be a set of size at most $6^{|C|}$ and such that for any $X \in S$ and $Y \subseteq E(G[\overline{A} \cup C])$, if X and Y are disjoint and $X \cup Y$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of G, then $\exists \hat{X} \in \hat{S}$ disjoint from Y so that $\hat{X} \cup Y$ is a Hamiltonian cycle in G. □ □

Proof of Lemma 6. We prove this first for a single certificate $S = \{G'\}$ and then generalize to a set S containing multiple certificates in the end of the proof.

Suppose Y is a set of edge disjoint paths so that $Y \cup G' \cup E'$ is a Hamiltonian cycle for some $E' \subseteq E^*$. We know neither E' nor Y consist of edges in $E(G[A])$. So, by temporarily removing the edges of $E(G[A])$ not in $E(G')$ we get a new graph G^* for which $Y \cup G' \cup E'$ is also a Hamiltonian cycle. Clearly, all Hamiltonian cycles of G^* are also Hamiltonian cycles of G. As was observed in [13], as all paths in G' must be incident with an edge of E' and each edge in



Figure 3: As described in the proof of Lemma 4. The dotted paths are Y and the solid paths constitute X. We see that if $Y \cup X$ is a Hamiltonian cycle in G (the left), then the torso of Y plus the torso of X in C must form a Hamiltonian cycle in the torso of G.

E' must be incident with a vertex in C, yet each vertex in C can be incident with at most two edges of E', there cannot be more than $2|C|$ paths in G'. Now let X be the endpoints of the paths in G'. Each path has at most 2 endpoints, so $|X|$ is at most $4|C|$. The set $X \cup C$ is of size at most $5k$ and disconnects G' from the rest of the graph. We then do the following subroutine to construct a preserving extension.

$S' = \{G'\}$
for each $e \in E'$ incident with X:
  for each $s \in S'$ add $s \cup \{e\}$ to S'
  reduce the size of S' using Lemma 4 with $X \cup C$ as separator
end for

The set S' resulted from this subroutine will be a preserving extension of G' by E', and by Lemma 4, its size will not exceed $2^{|C|+|X|} \leq 2^{5|C|}$. The runtime to create this set will be $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(2^{\mathcal{O}(|C|)})$.

For a set S of multiple certificates, we find for each $G' \in S$ a preserving extension $S_{G'}$ by E' and then reduce the size of their union to $6^{|C|}$ by Lemma 4, now using only C as the separator. The total runtime will now be $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|2^{\mathcal{O}(|C|)}$ still since it will take $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|2^{\mathcal{O}(|C|)})$ time to create the union and $n^{\mathcal{O}(1)}(|S|2^{\mathcal{O}(|C|)})$ time to reduce the size of this union. □ □

Proof of Lemma 16. It has already been shown in [13] that if v has weight $3k$ it cannot be adjacent to two other vertices of weight $3k$. So, we only need to prove that if v is not adjacent to any other vertex of weight $3k$ or more, the mm-value of $\text{tot}(v)$ is less than $6k$.

We know from Lemma 15 that there must exist a branch decomposition of G' of sm^ℓ-width less than $3k$, and all non trivial cuts have mm^ℓ-value less than $3k$. This means there must be a tri-partition $(\{v\}, A, B)$ of $V(G')$ so that $\text{sm}^\ell(\{v\})$, $\text{sm}^\ell(A)$, and $\text{sm}^\ell(B)$ are all less than $3k$.

Without loss of generality, we show that the number of vertices in $\mathrm{tot}(A)$ adjacent to $\mathrm{tot}(v)$ is less than $3k$. Since $(A, \{v\} \cup B)$ cannot be a split, A must either consist of a single vertex, or have $\mathrm{sm}^\ell(A) = \mathrm{mm}^\ell(A)$. If A consist of a single vertex, by our assumptions that v was not adjacent to any vertex of weight $3k$ or more, we have $|N(\mathrm{tot}(v)) \cap \mathrm{tot}(A)| < 3k$. If A consists of more than a single vertex, we know $\mathrm{mm}^\ell(A) = \mathrm{sm}^\ell < 3k$. Since any minimum vertex cover of $G[\mathrm{tot}(A), \mathrm{tot}(\{v\} \cup B)]$ must either consist of all of $\mathrm{act}(v)$ or none of it (since $\mathrm{act}(v)$ are twins in this bipartite graph), and $|\mathrm{act}(v)| \geq 3k > \mathrm{mm}^\ell(A)$, the minimum vertex cover of $G[\mathrm{tot}(A), \mathrm{tot}(\{v\} \cup B)]$ must consist of all the vertices of A adjacent to $\mathrm{tot}(v)$. Hence, $|N(\mathrm{tot}(v)) \cap \mathrm{tot}(A)| \leq \mathrm{mm}^\ell(A) \leq 3k$. The same arguments applies to B, so we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |N(\mathrm{tot}(v))| &\leq |N(\mathrm{tot}(v)) \cap A| + |N(\mathrm{tot}(v)) \cap B| \\ &< 3k + 3k \ . \end{aligned}$$

And so the mm-value of $\mathrm{tot}(v)$ is no more than $6k$ as $N(\mathrm{tot}(v))$ is a vertex cover of $(\mathrm{tot}(v), \overline{\mathrm{tot}(v)})$. □ □

Proof of Lemma 15. We will give a proof by construction. Let (T', δ') be a branch decomposition of G of optimal split-matching width. We will transform (T, δ) into a branch decomposition (T', δ') for $V(G')$. For each vertex $v \in V(G')$ of weight one, we simply replace the mapping to $\mathrm{act}(v)$ by a mapping to v. For the vertices $v \in V(G')$ of weight two or more, there will always be an edge e_v in T where at least one third of $\mathrm{act}(v)$ is on each side of the cut induced by e_v. For each vertex $v \in V(G')$ of weight at least two, we append a vertex mapping to v to such an edge e_v as depicted in Figure 4. We then repeatedly remove all leaves not mapping to a vertex in $V(G')$, so that we are left with a branch decomposition (T', δ') of $V(G')$ (see Figure 4). We now claim that this branch decomposition has lifted-sm-width no more than $3\,\mathrm{sm}(G)$.

For each trivial cut $(\{v\}, V(G') \setminus \{v\})$ of (T', δ') the lifted-sm-value is 1, as it is either a split or trivial-split. For each non-trivial cut (A', B') of (T', δ'), there is an associated non-trivial cut (A, B) in (T, δ) where for each $v \in A'/B'$ at least one third of $\mathrm{act}(v)$ is in A/B. Let C be a minimum vertex cover of $G[A, B]$. For a minimum vertex cover, two twins are either both in the cover, or both not in the cover, so for each vertex $v \in A/B$ either one third of $\mathrm{act}(v)$ is in C or none of $\mathrm{act}(v) \cap A/B$ is in C. Let C' be the vertices $v \in V(G')$ for which at least one third of $\mathrm{act}(v)$ is in C'. The size of $\mathrm{act}(C')$ is at most three times C and we will now show that $\mathrm{act}(C')$ in fact is a vertex cover of $G[\mathrm{tot}(A), \mathrm{tot}(B)]$, proving that the lifted-sm-width of G' is at most $3\,\mathrm{sm}(G)$.

There is an edge between a and b in $G[A', B']$ if and only if there is an edge between $\mathrm{tot}(a)$ and $\mathrm{tot}(b)$ in $G[\mathrm{tot}(A), \mathrm{tot}(B)]$. So, if for all edges uv in $G[A', B']$, either u or v is in C', we are done. Assume $uv \in E(G[A', B']$ where $u \in A'$ and $v \in B'$. This means one third of $\mathrm{act}(u)$ and one third of $\mathrm{act}(v)$ is on the opposite side of each other in (A, B). However, as $\mathrm{act}(u)$ are twins and adjacent to all of $\mathrm{act}(v)$, this means one third of either $\mathrm{act}(u)$ or $\mathrm{act}(v)$ must be in C, and hence u or v must be in C'. □ □



Figure 4: As described in the proof of Lemma 15. u,v, and w are vertices of the prime graph and the dotted lines are the pendants added to T (as described in the proof). To the right is the resulting decomposition (T', δ')